To: CINMS Advisory Council

From: Linda Krop, Conservation Representative

Re: Conservation Working Group Report, 5/21/01

The Conservation Working Group (CWG) met on May 21, 2001. Members present: Linda Krop, Environmental Defense Center, Chair; Greg Helms, Center for Marine Conservation, Co-Chair; Jesse Swanhuyser, Environmental Defense; Roberta Cordero, Chumash Maritime Association; Jean Holmes, League of Women Voters; Rick Skillin, Sierra Club; Cory Gallipeau, Conception Coast Project.

Linda Krop apprised the CWG and the public regarding the status of the Marine Reserves Working Group (MRWG) process and the upcoming SAC meeting scheduled for 5/23. Handouts were available that included: a written report from the MRWG including a problem statement, mission statement, goals and objectives, and implementation recommendations for marine reserves; the Science Panel's analysis of Maps A-D; and a composite map depicting "areas of overlap and non-overlap" from the final MRWG meeting. Linda reported that while the MRWG agreed to adopt the written report, the group failed to reach a consensus on a map of marine reserves within the existing Sanctuary.

Greg Helms discussed the composite map and offered a recommendation for the CWG to forward to the SAC at its 5/23 meeting. Greg recommended that the SAC be asked to forward the information that was developed during the MRWG process to the decision-making agencies (specifically, the CA Fish and Game Commission, which has jurisdiction up to 3 miles offshore the Channel Islands, and the Pacific Fisheries Management Council, which has jurisdiction from 3 miles offshore to the Sanctuary boundaries 6 miles offshore). The information that would be forwarded would include: the written MRWG report; maps A-D with the panel responses thereto, and the composite map. Greg also recommended that the SAC ask the Fish and Game Commission and the Council to take action on the proposal to establish marine reserves within the CINMS.

Substantive discussion ensued. Steve Roberson, a conservation representative on the MRWG offered his perspective. He advocated for forwarding the composite maps to the SAC. Other CWG and public members discussed the options available to the SAC. In particular, the CWG expressed a desire to have the science and socioeconomic panels

evaluate Maps E and I (the composite maps). CINMS staff informed the group that there would be no official response from the panels by 5/23; however, during the afternoon SAC discussion, we could ask for an informal response by the representatives that are present.

Following additional discussion, the CWG voted to:

- Note that the current decline in fisheries is the result of a variety of threats (including ocean pollution) and that marine reserves should be viewed as one tool among many;
- Affirm the CWG marine reserves recommendation adopted in March;
- Recommend that the SAC forward the following information to the CA Fish and Game Commission and Pacific Fisheries Management Council: the written MRWG report; and the 3/21/01 Impact Analysis on Reserve Options;
- Request an evaluation of the composite maps by the science and socioeconomic panels; and
- If the composite maps are forwarded to the decision-making agencies, require that they be accompanied by a clear explanation of what they represent and by the evaluations by the two technical panels.

If additional information will be made available prior to the June 19 SAC meeting, the CWG will meet again on **June 18**.

Finally, Roberta Cordero pointed out some concerns with the MRWG process; namely, concerns regarding the failure of the participants and facilitators to abide by consensus ground rules and to listen to one another, and the potential for abuse of the "veto power" that became a part of the process. The CWG recommended that the MRWG participants be asked to evaluate the MRWG process and to provide that information to the CINMS and the facilitators.